

Socio Economic Impact of Poverty on Children Socialization with Special Focus on Education

Tahir Farid¹, M. Naseem Anwar², Sadaf Iqbal³, Mirza Jan⁴, and Inayat Khattak⁵

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
Zhejiang University Hangzhou China.

²Lecturer in Communication & Media Studies Department at Khushal Khan Khattak University

³Department of Sociology, Kohat University of Science and Technology, Pakistan.

⁴Dean Faculty of Social Sciences, Khushal Khan Khattak University, Karak, Pakistan.

⁵National Resource Management, BKPAP SRSP Karak, Pakistan

ABSTRACT: Poverty bruised the overall shape of a society. The curse of poverty inhibits the way to success and prosperity. The children socialization particularly influence by this evil. The main damage to the society is that a large population of children sicks from the education due to poverty. This is the main dent to the prevailing situation. The present study titled "Socio economic impact of poverty on children socialization with special focus on education revealed that poverty influenced children socialization and education up to the large extent. The data was collected through interview schedule to analyze the impacts of poverty on education. In this study out of total population a sample size of 50 was selected. The natures of respondent were parents, male and female students. Interview schedule was used as a tool for data collection. The universe of this study comprised of village Terkha Koi, district Karak. The respondent selected randomly were 30 parents, 10 male and female students each. The results showed that poverty has adverse impact on education. The government should provide equal opportunities of education to all the children of the community.

Keyword: Socio Economic, Poverty, Children, Socialization and Education.

I. INTRODUCTION

The poverty can be defined as 'the lack of ability to attain a minimum standard of living'. Later, the World Bank (2000) defines poverty as lack of control over commodities, or as a severe limitation of the choice set over commodities, leading to pronounced deprivation in well being or welfare. This definition is much broader and extends beyond food and non-food items to include key resources and social determinants, which are essential for human development (World Bank, 1990)

.Socialization help people, find out to function effectively in their social worlds. How does the development of socialization happen? How do we find out to use the things of our society's material culture? How do we come to recognize the beliefs, values, and norms that symbolize its nonmaterial culture? This knowledge takes place through communication with various agents of socialization, like peer groups and families, in addition both formal and informal social institutions (Brooks, 2010).

<p>Corresponding Author : Tahir Farid, PhD Scholar, Department of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Zhejiang University Hangzhou China.</p>

Poverty severely affects child's early life, when it is determined, and when children live well below the poverty entrance. Poverty may control child development through at least five pathways: (1) child health and nutrition, (2) parent mental health and effective interactions, (3) provision of a stimulating home environment, (4) school and child care quality, and (5) neighbourhood conditions. Rising facts suggests that the influence of family poverty on children's cognitive outcomes may be entirely mediated by these pathways. (Nancy E et al, 1993).

Usually poor Parents have worse emotional and physical health. Researchers such as Rand Conger and colleagues, using the family stress model, have linked parental depressive symptoms to more conflict with youth children, which in turn results in less best emotional, social, and cognitive outcomes. Poor parental mental health also is associated with less stimulating home environments and harsher parent child interactions (Frank F et al, 1993).

Family income directly influences the material resources available to children in their homes. Higher income children benefit from higher levels of cognitively stimulating materials available in their homes compared to low-income children. The provision of a stimulating home environment, in turn, accounts for much of the effect of income on the cognitive development of playgroup and elementary school children and may be the most important pathway through which poverty operates (Robert et al, 1997).

Children from poor families are also showing to lower quality school and child care settings compared to their non-poor counterparts. Findings from two national child care studies, as described by Deborah

Phillips et al. (1994), indicate that up to 60 percent of subsidized and low-income child care centres failed to conform to legal child to staff ratios in child classrooms and most (70%) received low ratings on scales of appropriate care giving and the provision of suitable activities. Lower quality child care is connected with lower math and language ability, negative peer interactions, and more behaviour problems (David M, 1999).

The neighbourhoods in which poor families reside are another way through which income poverty may negatively affect children's educational outcomes. Financial strain limits the housing and neighbourhood choices available to low-income families, constraining these families to live in neighbourhoods characterized by high levels of crime and unemployment, low levels of resources, and a lack of collective efficacy among the residents. Neighbourhood residence, in turn, is associated with child and youth school outcomes above and past the effect of family poverty (ROBERT H et al, 1995).

Ermisch *et al.* (2001) said that children living in poverty are not only likely to be poorer in resources, but also to have limited opportunities for success. This is because of intergenerational transmission: for example, their families have lower expectations of work and education. Yaqub (2002), meanwhile, analysed data on persistence of poverty in several countries and found that children's class, education and health correlate strongly with that of parents and siblings. He suggests that socio-economic background influences lifetime attainments, but stresses that outcomes are not determined by childhood experiences alone. 'Resilience' and 'plasticity' (the ability to undo psychological or social damage) can counteract the effects of poverty at any

point in the child's lifetime. Only by their thirties are individuals' lifetime incomes correlated with annual incomes, suggesting that until they reach this age people can change their path.

McSherry's (2004) discussion of the relationship between neglect and poverty points out the dilemma that neglecting one's children is an individual behaviour, but poverty is a structural aspect of society. Blaming individual parents for neglecting their children is, from this perspective, tantamount to asserting that being poor is their responsibility. On the other hand, excusing their behaviour by explaining it as being a result of poverty assumes incorrectly that most poor parents are neglectful. He concludes that the relationship is circular and interdependent, rather than linear and causal.

Ross and Roberts (1999) have additionally observed that abuse and neglect of children can happen at any income level, but that low-income parents are four times more likely to feel chronically stressed than parents with higher incomes. Although family income has repeatedly been found to affect children's educational attainment and involvement, income effects appear to be partly mediated by other factors such as the physical home environment (McCulloch and Joshi, 2001). Other influences include parenting, especially parent child learning (reading, visits to the library) and parents' aspirations and attitudes towards education (Sammons *et al.*, 1997; McCulloch and Joshi, 2001; Desforges and Abouchaar, 2003).

II. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

Several controversies occur in the definition of poverty. The first is whether poverty should be defined in economic terms, or as part of a broader social disadvantage. The

economic definition of poverty is typically based on income measures, with the absolute poverty line calculated as the food expenditure necessary to meet dietary recommendations, supplemented by a small allowance for nonfood goods (Ravallion, M. 1992). However, many poverty researchers use a broader definition suggesting that "poor" means lacking not only material assets and health but also capabilities, such as social belonging, cultural identity, respect and dignity, and information and education. According to Sen, (1995) poverty means capability deprivation. A second difference is that some researchers and policy makers see poverty and poverty escape as primarily due to an individual condition, whereas others focus on the social exclusion factors which prevent groups or categories of peoples from moving out of poverty (Tilly, C. 2007). The multiple factors are illustrated in a series of case studies in *Voices of the Poor* by the World Bank. "Throughout the *Voices of the Poor* series people vividly describe multiple, interlocking sets of disadvantages that leave them powerless to get ahead. Experiences of ill-being including material lack and want (of food, housing and shelter, livelihood, assets and money); hunger, pain and discomfort; exhaustion and poverty of time; exclusion, rejection, isolation and loneliness; bad relations with others, including bad relations within the family; insecurity, vulnerability, worry, fear and low self-confidence; and powerlessness, helplessness, frustration and anger" (Narayan, d. & p. Petesch. 2002).

Poverty and Families

Families are the primary socializing agents for their children (Seeman et al. 2002). In addition to providing basic

necessities, such as food, shelter, and clothes, families transmit cultural and educational values and help children adapt to societal demands and opportunities. Early parent child interactions help children learn regulatory process and socialize them into the rhythm of their family and culture.

As Parker, Greer, and Zuckerman (1988) noted almost two decades ago, children growing up in poverty experience “double jeopardy.” Not only are they directly exposed to risks in their homes and communities, including illnesses, crowding and family stress, lack of psychosocial stimulation, and limited resources, but they often experience more serious consequences to risks than children from higher income families. In spite of the attention given to the deleterious effects of poverty on children over the past several decades, rates of poverty remain high, particularly in families with young children, (Trends, C. 2006) and there has been limited attention to the processes whereby poverty impacts children’s education and development. One reason for the lack of progress has been an over-reliance on basic models that emphasize the direct effects of poverty, with little attention to the mechanisms linking poverty to children’s development.

Moderated Effects of Poverty

A moderated effect is one in which the effects of poverty varies across characteristics of families or children .For example, families who are poorly educated with poor decision-making skills may have more difficulty protecting their children from the effects of poverty than families who are better educated with rational decision-making skills (Shipler, D. 2005). Moderated effects may also operate by conferring protection on children. For

example, the Family Investment Model proposes that parents who are better educated or have access to financial resources invest in their children through educationally enhancing materials (such as books) and activities (reading), thus protecting their children from the effects of poverty. Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, Bradley and colleagues (1994) demonstrated that families above the poverty line were more likely to engage in cognitively enhancing activities with their children than were families below the poverty line.

Family characteristics may also influence the association between poverty and children’s development through a process known as social selection (Conger, R.D 2007). The social selection perspective hypothesizes that individual differences in parental traits lead to differences in income and in turn impact on children’s development. For example, parents who have pro social attributes, such as honesty, integrity, and dependability, transmit these values to their children, thus conferring protection even in the face of poverty (Mayer, R. 1997).

Objective of the study

1. To know about the impacts of poverty with special focus on education in children.
2. To know that due to poverty either male child are most affected or female.
3. To know that in which level of education children are mostly affected.
4. To give suggestions on the basis of study findings.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted to investigate the impacts of poverty on children socialization with special focus on education in District Karak at Village Tarkha koi. This section acquaints us about the sample size, sampling techniques, universe of the study, data collection and data analysis respectively. The data was collected through structured interview schedule. In probability sampling, simple random sampling was used. To ensure the reliability and validity of the data to

maximum level, a well thought out questionnaire was designed by using Likert Scale. The respondents were 30 parents, 10 male and female students each selected randomly. The data was analyzed by using a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 18 Version).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the results of male students regarding impacts of poverty on children socialization with special focus on education.

	Questions	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	Total
1	Feeling some difference in education due to poverty	16(80%)	4(20%)	-	20 (100%)
2	Doing labor due to poverty	16(80%)	4(20%)	-	20 (100%)
3	Want to get further education but cannot due to poverty	14(70%)	6(30%)	-	20 (100%)
4	Feeling inferiority among friends due to poverty	10(50%)	10(50%)	-	20 (100%)
5	Disheartened due to poverty	10(50%)	10(50%)	-	20 (100%)
6	Parents force to do labor due to poverty	12(60%)	8(40%)	-	20 (100%)
7	Poverty force to earn through illegitimate way	6(30%)	14(70%)	-	20 (100%)

4.1 RESPONSE OF MALE STUDENTS

The above table shows the results about feeling some difference in education due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 16(80%) were agreed that there is difference among students in school due to poverty, and 4(20%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0% were undecided. Same is explained by Deborah Phillips et al (1994). Similarly, the above table shows the results about doing labour due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 16(80%) were agreed that there is difference among students in school due to poverty, and 4(20%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0% were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of want to get further education but cannot due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 14(70%) were agreed that they cannot get further education due to poverty, and 6(30%) were disagreed with this statement. In addition, the above table shows the results of feeling inferiority

among friends due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 10(50%) were agreed that they feel inferiority among friends due to poverty, and 10(50%) were disagreed with this statement. Similarly, the above table shows the results of disheartened due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 10(50%) were agreed that they are disheartened due to poverty, and 10(50%) were disagreed with this statement. Similarly, the above table shows the results of parents force to do labour due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 12(60%) were agreed that they are forced to do labour due to poverty, and 8(40%) were disagreed with this statement. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of poverty force to earn through illegitimate way. Among 20 respondents 6(30%) were agreed that they earn through illegitimate way due to poverty, and 14(70%) were disagreed with this

Questions	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	Total
Discrimination in education is due to poverty	20(100%)	00(00%)	-	20 (100%)
Feeling difference in attitude of teachers in school	16(80%)	4(20%)	-	20 (100%)
Parents are not interested in your education	12(60%)	8(40%)	-	20 (100%)
Not considered a permanent member of family	10(50%)	10(50%)	-	20 (100%)
Tradition has some impacts on education	10(50%)	10(50%)	-	20 (100%)
Wrong interpretation has some impacts on education	18(90%)	2(10%)	-	20 (100%)
Patriarchy has some impacts on education	14(70%)	6(30%)	-	20 (100%)

statement. Same is explained by (Robert H et al, 1995).

4.2 RESPONSE OF FEMALE STUDENTS

The above table shows the results of discrimination in education due to poverty. Among 20 respondents 20(100%) were agreed that they are discriminated in education due to poverty, and 0(00%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Ross and Roberts (1999) have also observed that discrimination and neglect of children can happen at any income level, but that low-income parents are four times more likely to feel chronically stressed than parents with higher incomes. Similarly, the above table shows the results of feeling difference in attitude of teachers in school. Among 20 respondents 16(80%) were agreed that they feel difference in attitude of teacher in school, and 4(20%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of parents are not are not interested in your education. Among 20 respondents 8(40%) were agreed that their parents are not interested in their education, and 12(60%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. In

addition, the above table shows the results of not considered a permanent member of family. Among 20 respondents 10(50%) were agreed that they are not consider the permanent member of his family, and 10(50%) were disagreed with this statement. Similarly, the above table shows the results of tradition has some impacts on education. Among 20 respondents 10(50%) were agreed that tradition has impacts on their education, and 10(50%) were disagreed with this statement. The above table shows the results of wrong interpretation has some impacts on education. Among 20 respondents 18(90%) were agreed that wrong interpretation has some impacts on education, and 2(10%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. In addition, the above table shows the results of Patriarchy has some impacts on education. Among 20 respondents 14(70%) were agreed that patriarchy has the impacts on education, and 6(20%) were disagreed with this statement.

Questions	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	Total
Poverty has impacts on children socialization	48(80%)	12(20%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty has impacts on children education	46(77%)	20(33%)	-	60 (100%)
Children have lack of confidence due to poverty	42(70%)	18(30%)	-	60 (100%)
Children's are psychologically disturbed due to poverty	34(47%)	26(43%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty effect personality development of children	42(70%)	18(30%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty is an obstacle in the way of provision uniform to children	34(57%)	26(43%)	-	60 (100%)
Children feel inferiority complex due to poverty	42(70%)	18(30%)	-	60 (100%)
Children suffer from child labor due to poverty	28(47%)	26(43%)	-	60 (100%)
Children feel helplessness due to poverty	42(70%)	18(30%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty create antisocial behavior in children	20(33%)	40(67%)	-	60 (100%)
Children beg due to poverty	24(40%)	36(60%)	-	60 (100%)
Government helps in provision of education to children	18(30%)	42(70%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty badly effect the dropout ratio of children	46(77%)	20(33%)	-	60 (100%)
Poverty hinder the learning capacity of the children	34(57%)	26(43%)	-	60 (100%)

4.3 RESPONSE OF PARENTS

The above table shows the results of poverty has impacts on children socialization. Among 60 respondents 48(80%) were agreed that poverty has impacts on children socialization, and 12(20%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided, Same is explained by (Trends, C. 2006) . In addition, the above table shows the results of poverty has impacts on children education. Among 60 respondents 36(60%) were agreed that poverty has impacts on children education, and 24(40%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of Children have lack of confidence due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 42(70%) were agreed that children have lack of confidence due to poverty, and 18(30%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided, Similarly Parker, Greer, and Zuckerman (1988) also explained this that Children's are psychologically disturbed due to poverty and have lack of confidence. The

above table also shows the results of children psychologically disturbed due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 26(43%) were agreed that children are psychologically disturbed due to poverty, and 34(47%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of poverty effect personality development of children. Among thirty parents 30(50%) were agreed that poverty effect personality development of children, and 30(50%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Similarly, the above table shows that poverty an obstacle in the way of provision uniform to children. Among 60 respondents 34(47%) were agreed that poverty an obstacle in the way of provision uniform to children, and 26(43%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. In addition, the above table shows the results of children feel inferiority complex due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 42(70%) were agreed that children feel

inferiority complex due to poverty, and 18(30%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of children suffer from child labor due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 28(47%) were agreed that children from suffer child labor due to poverty, and 32(53%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Similarly, the above table shows the results of children feel helplessness due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 42(70%) were agreed that children feel helplessness due to poverty, and 18(30%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Similarly, the above table shows the results of poverty create antisocial behaviour in children. Among 60 respondents 20(33%) were agreed that they feel hesitation in going school, and 40(67%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. Furthermore, the above table shows the results of children beg due to poverty. Among 60 respondents 24(40%) were agreed that they feel hesitation in going school, and 36(60%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided. In addition to it, the above table shows the results of government helps in provision of education to children. Among 60 respondents 18(30%) were agreed that they feel hesitation in going school, and 42(70%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided the same is explained by Narayan, D. & P. Petesch. 2002. Similarly, the above table shows the results of poverty badly effect the dropout ratio of children. Among 60 respondents 46(77%) were agreed that poverty badly effect the dropout ratio of children, and 14(23%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided.

Similarly, the above table shows the results of poverty hinder the learning capacity of the children. Among 60 respondents 34(57%) were agreed that they feel hesitation in going school and 26(43%) were disagreed with this statement, and 0(00%) were undecided.

Suggestion and recommendation

Poverty is key indicator for children's poor socialization and limited education. It is most to find out ways and means to reduce poverty, essential for children healthy participation in the grooming of society. Government should provide equal educational opportunities for the uplift of community in order to alleviate poverty.

IV. REFERENCES

1. Bradley, R .L. Whiteside & D. Mundfrom (1994). Early Indications of Resilience and Their Relation to Experiences in the Home Environments of Low Birthweight, Premature Children Living in Poverty. *Child Dev.* 65: 346–360.
2. Brooks,Barnes.(2010) "Pixar Removes Its First Female Director." *The New York Times*, December 20. Retrieved August 2, 2011 From (<http://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/10/20/first-woman-to-direct-a-pixar-film-is- instead-first-to-be-replaced/?ref=arts>).
3. Conger, R.D. & M.B. Donnellan.(2007). An interactionist perspective on the socioeconomic context of human development. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 58: 175–199.
4. David M (1999) "The Effect of Income on Child Development." Review of

- Economics and Statistics 81 (2):261–276.
5. Desforges, C. and Abouchaar, A. (2003) *The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Achievements and Adjustment: A Literature Review*, Research Report No. 433. London: DfES
 6. Ermisch, J., Francesconi, M. and Pevalin, D. J. (2001) *Outcomes for Children of Poverty*, DWP Research Report No. 158. Leeds: HMSO
 7. Frank F. et al.(1993)."Early Warning Signs of Functional Illiteracy: Predictors in Childhood and Adolescence." *Child Development* 64 (3):815–829.
 8. McCulloch, A. and Joshi, H. E. (2001) 'Neighbourhood and family influences on the cognitive ability of children in the British National Child Development Study', *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 53, No. 5, pp. 579–91
 9. McSherry, D. (2004) 'Which came first, the chicken or the egg? Examining the relationship between child neglect and poverty', *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 34, pp. 727–33
 10. Nancy, E., et al. (1993). "Socioeconomic Inequalities in Health: No Easy solution." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 69:3140–3145.
 11. Narayan, D. & P. Petesch. (2002). *Voices of the Poor: From Many Lands*. Oxford University Press for the World Bank. New York.
 12. Parke, R. (2002) 'Fathers and families', in M. H. Bornstein (ed.) *Handbook of Parenting, Vol. 3: Social Conditions and Applied Parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
 13. Parker, S., S. Greer & B. Zuckerman. (1988) Double jeopardy: the impact of poverty on early child development. *Pediatr. Clin. North Am.* 35: 1227–1240.
 14. Ravallion, M. (1992). *Poverty Comparisons: A Guide to Concepts and Methods*. Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper 88, World Bank, Washington.
 15. Repetti, R.L., S.E. Taylor & T.E. Seeman (2002) Risky families: family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychol. Bull.* 128: 330– 366.
 16. Robert H. (1995) "Home Environment and Parenting." In *Handbook of parenting, Vol. 2: Biology and Ecology of Parenting*, ed. Marc H. Bornstein. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
 17. Robert T, et al (1997) "Why So Many Children Are poor." *The Future of Children* 7 (2):25–39.
 18. Ross, D. P. and Roberts, P. (1999) *Income and Child Well-being: A New Perspective on the Poverty Debate*. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development
 19. Sen, A. (1995). *The Political Economy of Targeting. In Public Spending and the Poor: Theory and Evidence*. D. van de Walle & K. Nead, Eds.: 11–24.

- Johns Hopkins University Press.
Baltimore.
20. Shipler, D. (2005). *The Working Poor: Invisible in America*. Alfred A. Knopf. New York.
21. theory?', *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 14, pp. 1081–93
22. Tilly, c. (2007). Poverty and the politics of exclusion. *In* Moving Out of Poverty Volume 1: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Mobility. Palgrave MacMillian and The World Bank. Washington, DC.
23. Trends, C. (2006). *Assessing the Educational Indicators in the Kids Count Data Book*. Annie E Casey Foundation. Baltimore.